

CONSER Operations Committee Meeting
May 1-2, 2003
Summary of meeting

Jean Hiron, CONSER Coordinator, and Les Hawkins, CONSER Specialist, welcomed approximately 40 representatives from CONSER institutions and LC staff to the annual meeting at the Library of Congress. The entire first day was devoted to discussion of the "aggregator-neutral" record. A joint meeting with the BIBCO Operations Committee was held on the afternoon of May 2nd.

A. Background discussions: Trends

Regina Reynolds (LC), set the stage for the discussions by explaining trends in publishing and the serials environment that she believes will have an impact on how CONSER does its work in the future.

1. OPACs. Libraries are concerned that if records for electronic resources are not integrated into the OPAC, users will ignore the wealth of print and other resources that is included in their catalogs. Frustration with multiple records is really a matter of displays.
2. Serials management systems. More libraries are going to need some form of help with local management of electronic resources, rights management, and upkeep of URLs.
3. Open URL. Products like SFX and Journal Finder are facilitating article-level retrieval and changing the way linking works.
4. Future of print. Scholarly publishers are more likely to discontinue the printed publication once archiving models have been established. They are anxious to do this now!
5. Archiving. Efforts such as LOCKSS (Lots Of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) may have an impact on our cataloging. LOCKSS is a cooperative effort aiming to preserve the serial as published by the publisher and purchased by individual institutions. Having permanent local control and access to electronic resources will also make it possible to discontinue the print or make it secondary.
6. Aggregations. There seems to be a growing trend for publishers to pull their serials out of the large aggregations. With the future access to articles via link resolvers, will the large article databases be needed? However, Regina sees no trend in discontinuing the journal itself as an entity.
7. Local customization. In today's environment, every library seems to do something a little different, making it very difficult to find the common ground for sharing via cooperative programs.

Background discussions: Coverage of records in the CONSER database

Jean Hiron led the discussion on the questions raised in a paper that was sent to CONSER libraries prior to the meeting. Most libraries held meetings with staff at different levels to discuss the questions that dealt with both local and CONSER policies.

Questions regarding CONSER libraries

How important is OPAC access to electronic serials? There was common agreement that it is very important. However, not all in their institutions agree with this. Students like Web lists; librarians like records and both forms of access are needed. Both approaches are being used in most libraries.

How important is it to describe the electronic serial in a separate record? Most agreed that it was only somewhat important. From the users point of view, the single record approach is more desirable, because there are fewer records to deal with. But librarians are realizing that the single record approach may not be feasible with the need for record sets to manage packages. Some prefer separate records to enable a scan of the database for records with uniform titles qualified with "online." Cornell is currently using what they are calling "sleek" records, which are very brief records that show coverage for each aggregation. The records are added and dropped every three months to maintain the data.

What is your library's current policy regarding the single-record approach and what do you expect it to be in the near-term? Most said that they are using it and plan to continue to use it for some serials. Only four libraries were using separate records exclusively. However, some libraries that have relied very heavily on the single record approach foresee moving away from it in order to have a separate record to attach payment information to, in order to be able to buy records from vendors, and to facilitate maintenance. The idea of separate records seems more palatable with the idea of one record for the print and one record for all online manifestations. (CD-ROMs weren't considered to be much of an issue at this point.) Many libraries are using or considering using holdings records to display online availability.

Is your library in the process of, or considering canceling the print versions of serials, and if so, how might this change current policies? Only a quarter of those present thought this was an issue. In California, consortium-wide cancellation is taking place which means the cataloging is becoming more centralized.

Is your library using or planning to use record sets from Serials Solutions or TDNet and if so, how might that change your current cataloging practices, if at all? Most libraries were using the services from one of the companies. The primary impact on maintenance is on the URLs.

Questions regarding CONSER policy

Should the CONSER database contain a record for all titles in any form of aggregation? If not, which ones should CONSER focus on? There was general agreement that titles contained in the large article-based databases do not reflect individual institutions' collection policies and thus, titles contained only in these databases are not necessarily desirable in the CONSER database. Attendees agreed that CONSER members should concentrate their efforts on the serials that exist as discrete entities in packages rather

than on titles that appear in article databases. Initial agreement was to exclude records for titles contained only in article databases from the CONSER database; however, in subsequent discussions about the usefulness of these records by those purchasing the CONSER database, the decision was reversed. However, all agreed that CONSER libraries would not be willing to create or maintain records for such titles.

What means do you think should be used to create such records? Records for any kind of electronic serial can be cataloger-created or machine-derived (machine-derived records are discussed in the report of the PCC task force, see below). There was recognition that if there are to be records for titles in an article database, in many cases these could only be derived from the print records, as the serial does not exist as an entity. Machine-derived records could also be used initially at least, to provide missing records for titles included in packages, such as Ingenta. These records are more likely to be upgraded and maintained over time. While CONSER does not want to have to maintain records for such titles, there was acknowledgment that library staff want these records in their catalogs for ILL and document delivery purposes.

If machine-derived records are included in the CONSER database, what are the implications for future maintenance of these records? The question was raised as to whether a CONSER library should be responsible for revising such a record, if their library does not also hold the print. The group agreed that URLs should not be included on such records as the records are being made available primarily for use by libraries and serials management companies who will perform in-house maintenance. Given that such records will be part of the CONSER database, perhaps CONSER enhance membership should be expanded to allow for maintenance of these records.

What should CONSER's policy be re URLs? After several discussions, the result is that CONSER will retain/add/maintain URLs for packages of electronic serials that exist as discrete entities. URLs will be included for free e-serials, but use of PURLS for these is highly recommended. Machine-derived records for titles in databases should not contain URLs. When asked how many libraries are willing to help maintain the URLs in the CONSER records, a good number raised their hands.

Other suggestions included CONSER's working with publishers to promote stable, permanent access to the electronic serial and to gather opinions from interlibrary loan librarians who have a need to know exactly what another library owns.

B. Defining the aggregator-neutral record

Hirons began by offering a list of assumptions or goals that could be used to test the various alternatives against. All agreed to the following list:

- Guidelines should be applicable to all electronic serials (if possible)
- Resulting records have been created according to the same or similar principles as other serials and other resources
- The record identifies the serial and its online nature

- Data in the record should be applicable to all online manifestations (as much as possible)
- Records are “clean” and can be easily added to
- Records should be useful

B1. Sources of the description

Les Hawkins (LC) led the discussion. The group recommended a list of sources in priority order. Clarification on terminology was requested to distinguish host sites from aggregations. The “publisher’s site” would only be preferred when it contained the text of the articles, and not just tables of contents or abstracts. The question of whether we needed to prescribe sources was raised. There was general agreement that a “road map” would be useful, with judgment applied for deciding when to prefer a particular source. The group agreed on the following preferred list:

- Publisher’s site when it contains the full text
- A host (e.g. Ingenta, HighWire) or archive site (e.g. JSTOR). Prefer such a site over the publisher’s site if the first issue is only available here.
- Record for the print.
- Other aggregations, including serial packages and databases (e.g., Firstsearch, ProQuest)

B2. Uniform titles

Kevin Randall (Northwestern) led a lively discussion on the proposals presented to the group. There was much discussion about the need for collocation, about FRBR and whether collocation under FRBR would be achieved via uniform titles, and the need to make decisions across the board, not for a specific group of publications. With all of this in mind, the group decided to accept only one of the proposals:

When the print or existing record has a uniform title, the same qualifier will be applied to the record for the online or later record, even if the data in that qualifier does not apply to the later version (e.g., place of publication is different).

The proposals to add “online” to all online serials, regardless of the need for distinguishing, and to use the title proper of the related serial when in the uniform title for the online, were rejected. There was a feeling that these proposals did not agree with the stated goals (above) and that it wasn’t the right time to make such changes.

Action: LCRI 25.5B will be reviewed to determine whether any revision is necessary. A side issue that arose and may need further exploration is whether to stop the practice of using \$c Original in the 776 field for microforms, rather than giving the entry.

B3. Descriptive elements and database cleanup

Robert Bremer led the group through his document that laid out suggested policies for creation of aggregator-neutral records on a field-by-field basis, and how these policies would be accomplished in the database cleanup effort.

130/240. We will cease recording the name of aggregator, provider, or the name of a particular aggregation in uniform titles. Further database clean up is still pending.

245. The proposal to record the title from the earliest available issue on the preferred source was agreed to. In regard to maintenance, there will be cases of title changes where a subsequent cataloger does not have access to the same provider's version of an online serial that was used as the basis of the description. Consequently, catalogers will need to judge whether a major change in title is a likely change for the entire online serial or just the provider's version they are viewing. No particular database clean up is needed.

246. The wording "Issues from some providers have title:" will be used in 246 subfield \$i when making added entries for variants on other provider versions. No particular database clean up is needed, although OCLC staff may encounter this situation while working with existing records.

260 \$a and \$b. CONSER catalogers agreed to record the first named place and publisher in the first or earliest issue applicable to all instances of the online serial. For a subsequently digitized serial, this will result in the print version publisher being recorded. No particular database clean up is needed.

260 \$c. Catalogers agreed to record dates of publication as found in the serial (alternative 1 on the task group's report) as opposed to recording those specifically related to publication of the online serial. For serials with a history in print, the dates of digitization or availability of the online serial will not be recorded. For a new serial that is born-digital, or new in print and online formats, the dates will reflect both publication and online availability. The decision was driven by local system display concerns, where 260 dates are preferred over 362 dates per a monograph cataloging model. It was also acknowledged that these dates would be more useful and more aggregator-neutral, thus, more in line with the stated goals. No particular database clean up is needed.

310/321. Current and former frequencies as found in the serial will be recorded without worrying about their applicability to the online serial. No database clean up is needed.

362. CONSER catalogers will cease recording the "Coverage as of" note. Instead, catalogers will use "362 1 Print began with ..." when information about the print version is known and no dates of publication are given. There will still be cases where "362 1 Began with ..." will be applicable in cataloging online serials as well as "362 0 Vol. 1, no. 1 ..." both as in cataloging any serial, but the inclusion of the word "Print" would clearly identify the source of the information as a related print version title without necessarily making an incorrect statement about the beginning of the online serial. Clean up will adjust the two fields based on data in the original record.

500 Description based on and Latest issue consulted notes. Catalogers will explicitly state the source of the description, not only in terms of the provider, but also the format of source, i.e., HTML vs. PDF. Some expressed the belief that the format is equally important and more useful in terms of identifying the same content that might have been sold by a publisher to various providers. No particular database clean up is needed.

500/550 Digitizer notes. Catalogers will cease recording notes on agencies involved in digitizing and providing serials online. Database clean up is pending.

506. It was agreed that the restrictions on access note would no longer be given in most cases, because it is usually institution or aggregator-specific. However, it may still be needed for government documents to indicate that the serial is classified or otherwise restricted. GPO (and subsequently NLC) expressed concerns about eliminating the note entirely, but the routine "Subscription required for access" would appear to be no longer needed. If needed, this information could go in \$z of the 856 field. Further effort will be necessary to determine what can be done with existing records, but it should be possible to make some changes.

516. CONSER catalogers will cease recording notes to characterize the type of computer file or data. There may still be cases where this information would be useful; however, notes such as "Text (electronic journal)" do not seem useful. Most 516 notes will be deleted as part of the clean up.

538. Catalogers agreed to continue recording a mode of access note to better identify the serial as an online serial, but they will cease recording the system requirements note in most cases. The system requirements note may be used in more unusual cases and when it is certain that all versions would have the same requirements.

With elimination of the above notes, there are concerns of losing information. However, much of the information applies only to particular providers. Field 856 subfield \$z is the alternative place to record much of the provider-specific information and will need to be promoted as such in the documentation.

710/730. Catalogers agreed to cease using fields 710 and 730 to trace the names of aggregators, providers, and titles of aggregations or sets. Database clean up will likely be based on a systematic removal of entries via compiled lists.

856. URLs for publisher and host sites will be recorded, but not for article-based databases. One exception is that if an article-based database were the source of the description, it would be recorded in 856. It was also noted that multiple URLs will be needed in cases where the coverage is split among multiple providers.

Action: Guidelines based on these decisions for the aggregator-neutral record will be issued in CCM Module 31 and on the CONSER Website. Implementation will begin July 1, 2003.

B4. Machine-derived records

Ruth Haas (Harvard) discussed the recommendations for machine-derived records from the Third PCC Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases. Many of the decisions are included above under “Questions regarding CONSER policy.”

What would CONSER use machine-derived records for?

- Machine-derived records are appropriate for helping to fill gaps in packages where titles remain discrete, such as Ingenta, as well as for larger article based databases, such as ProQuest. All machine-derived records can be included in the CONSER database, so long as they are clearly labeled.
- If there are no records from which to derive a record for titles that are only in an article databases, CONSER libraries will not be responsible for creating records.

What authentication code should be used for machine-derived records?

- The suffix “-m” will be attached to existing 042 codes in the record, so that authoritativeness of the existing record could be determined: lcd-m, lc-m, nsdp-m, etc. The task group will need to consider what will be done when multiple codes exist in a record, e.g. 042 \$a nsdp \$a lc. Use of a code to identify non-conser records will also be needed, either “ncon-m” as suggested by the task group or perhaps another code.

What elements are needed in machine-derived records in order for them to be useful?

- The task group’s report identified many fields to be carried over from the print record that don’t seem appropriate for the machine-derived record for the online serial. It was suggested that the group pare down the list, especially the numerous note fields, many of which are not used for serials.

Should URLs be included in records for machine-derived records?

- Attendees felt that URLs should not be included on records for titles in article-based databases, because the URLs are likely to be less stable, the records are there for the use of the serials management companies, and most work would be done in-house. CONSER catalogers could not be responsible for maintaining URLs on such records.

Next step

- The task group is testing the creation of a small record set based on Lexis-Nexis in order to determine how records will be authenticated, which fields are needed to facilitate local use, and how to avoid creating duplicate records.

Education of aggregators

Regina Reynolds solicited input on the developing NISO standard for the exchange of serials subscription information. The standard will include best practices for presenting the title and ISSN and provides guidelines for electronic texts. Some suggestions offered by CONSER members included:

- publishers should apply for a separate ISSN for each physical format
- clearly present and label the ISSN for the print and electronic versions
- print both print and electronic ISSN on both versions
- print the correct ISSN with the correct title (keep earlier ISSN with the earlier titles, etc.)
- retain earlier title presentations
- use the same title on the digitized version that is used on the print version (or make any differences very clear)
- provide URIs that go directly to the journal homepage, rather than general subscription or package pages
- use ISSN as part of URI
- provide clear notification of when titles are added or dropped from packages
- provide PDF or other image of print version covers and other pages from the print that show bibliographic information.
- provide clear coverage information
- agree on a definition of full text

Other ISSN issues

Regina reported that a new edition of the ISSN manual has been distributed for comment and it is hoped it will be published summer 2003 in paperbound form. The scope of the manual has been widened to include all continuing resources, including integrating resources. The ISSN network however, is not using integrating entry for integrating resources, it is creating successive entry records for them. Without code "i," NSDP is unable to authenticate and send records for integrating resources to the ISSN network through its regular method of record distribution through the CONSER database.

Other ISSN concerns include the review of the ISSN NISO standard that is undertaken every five years. The current review is attempting to assess how the policy of separate ISSN assignments for different formats is working. Along these lines, a proposal for using a suffix to add to a "basic work" ISSN to identify manifestations is also being considered. LC, NLM, and CC:DA have expressed endorsement of the proposal. Attendees of the operations meeting also favored the idea. Maureen Landry said it appears, from her recent attendance at the ISSN Governing Board Meeting, there may not be as much support for this idea in the European community.

Another ISSN issue involves the idea of incorporating the ISSN as a part of the ISO International Standard Text Code (ISTC) which is intended to uniquely identify individual textual works. Regina is on a working group investigating use of the ISSN as part of the ISTC to identify the print journal from which digitized text is derived.

C. Report from LC / AACR2 implementation

Lucy Barron reported that LC cataloging rates are up since implementation of the ILS has been completed. Software for entering Arabic and Persian in the vernacular is being tested by Hoda Fateen and a new "Appendix E: Creating Records with Data in Non-Roman Script for Arabic Serials" will be made available on CONSER's Website and added to the CEG. The Serial Record Division (SRD) is getting ready to provide access to electronic serials through its OPAC, after joining the EZB consortium. Selection from among the 17,000 titles covered in EZB is underway; in the meantime, SRD is planning to provide access through its OPAC for over 4,000 known free titles in EZB. Lucy mentioned that LC is also considering using PURLs for free resources because of the advantage of cooperative maintenance.

Implementation of AACR2 went smoothly, particularly in the cataloging sections. The major impact has been on LC's acquisitions sections where there have been questions about what is considered a title change.

Lucy asked how the new CEG section B 3.2, "First Time Authentication Of An Existing Unauthenticated Record," was working. This raised the issue of how CONSER members have been taught to handle first time authentication. Some believed that records citing an issue earlier than the one in hand should be redescribed during authentication. Others, including LC staff, indicated that if the record seemed like a valid AACR2 record, they would accept the copy with few changes (this is what the new section states). Advantages of this approach include not wiping out corporate or title added entries, which might have been recorded based on earlier issues, but don't appear on later issues. Also, it facilitates copy cataloging to be able to accept the copy as it is.

Until the recent revision of the CEG, the policy for acceptance of data on unauthenticated records has not been clearly stated in CONSER documentation. The group agreed to accept the new guidelines as written.

Integrating resources

David Van Hoy (MIT) asked Operations members how they are dealing with integrating resources, who in their institution is cataloging them, and what issues are coming up. About a third indicated they were responsible for cataloging at least some integrating resources. At one institution, both monograph and serial catalogers catalog them, though the serials catalogers are most likely to handle integrating resources that are related to particular serial titles. In other institutions, the same catalogers have always cataloged integrating resources and serials. One member said they had always done loose-leafs as serials to enable check-in. Other comments included the fact that learning to do the

maintenance on records for integrating resources on OCLC is new for some monograph catalogers.

Digitization of selected issues of a serial

John Levy (LC) discussed treatment options when only selected issues of a serial are digitized, particularly for in-house digitization. The examples he gave could be handled various ways and are based on recent titles digitized by LC. CONSER members generally agreed to the approaches outlined below:

1. One volume out of 80 is digitized: URL for the single volume is added to the holdings record.
2. Two volumes have been published, all are digitized: either use a one record approach or create a separate record.
3. Scattered volumes are digitized: add information to the bibliographic record in a \$z or \$3 of the 856, if it can be given in a non-specific way (e.g. "Some issues available..."). Otherwise information about the scattered volumes could be added to the holdings record.

D. Publication patterns: survey results on electronic journals and publication pattern data

Steve Shadle (University of Washington) led this discussion. The survey explored the interest in recording patterns and holdings information for electronic journals.

A third of the respondents said detailed check-in information for e-serials would or could be useful for: automated check-in (III has this feature), document delivery and interlibrary loan, to set up holdings on link resolvers or in serials management systems.

Operations representatives were asked: Are publication patterns important for e-serials? There was mixed opinion on this. Some felt it would be important when online versions become the primary manifestation, and so holdings data for e-serials will play a larger role in the future. It was pointed out that the LOCKSS archiving system crawls e-serial titles to provide reports on what has been archived, perhaps this would be a way to capture holdings data. Carlen Rushoff mentioned an idea she was discussing with Jean of an advisory forum for the future of CONSER. The forum would include stakeholders (libraries, vendors, etc.) to help build strategies for dealing with electronic resources in general and would also include specific strategies for e-serials and the use of holdings data.

E. Membership discussion

Sue Fuller (University of Texas at Austin) led this discussion on database coverage and CONSER membership structure.

Ideas for expanding CONSER database coverage

- Expand the Enhance category to include creation and authentication of records.
- Bring in libraries that create records for state and local documents
- Find funding for digitizing holdings of small unique collections that include the need for cataloging.
- Consider categories of backlogs for which records don't exist, what sort of non-CONSER serial records do you create locally, what type of maintenance are you doing? Who could help us fill in gaps in these areas?

International scope of CONSER expansion

- The need for help with particular languages, Spanish, German, and Cyrillic languages may offer opportunities for attracting institutions that can help in these areas.
- CONSER involvement in international projects such as the SUNCAT project in the UK and cooperative projects in Mexico are possibilities.

Membership structure

Reasons why numerical goals may be a problem:

- Implementation of new major/minor title change rules mean that fewer new records will be created.
- More time currently is spent on maintenance and copy cataloging.
- The implementation of the aggregator-neutral record may mean that fewer records are created.
- E-resources take up time that could be used for processing print backlogs.
- There is an increasing amount of work on integrating resources that can't be counted towards CONSER credit because records for integrating resources are not authenticated.

Training issues, suggestions:

- Use live telephone conferencing at the "high end" and more distance learning at the "low end"
- Use SCCTP workshop material for CONSER training

Operations Meeting

Currently we invite all members to attend, but financial assistance is only given to full and associate members. If we increase membership, we may need to alter how financial support is given. Could other ways of calculating the amount of support received be devised? Ideas include:

- Decide the amount of support by how far a member has to travel (this might be too difficult to implement)
- Place a cap on the amount that OCLC contributes
- Consider the fact that institutions vary in the amount of money they give to staff to attend CONSER meetings, the money OCLC gives is more important for some institutions than others.
- Rotate funding for associate members

Levels of membership

- If a full member is having difficulty with meeting numerical requirements, they could change to a lower category.
- The numerical goals for associates could be lowered, funding for the meeting removed, and some enhance members moved to associate level. This would allow current enhance members who routinely close off ceased titles to contribute the new records they create to CONSER.
- It is becoming increasingly difficult to create new records, so it would be useful to remove the numeric requirements altogether. On the other hand, maybe numeric requirements help assure that cataloging skills are maintained and are up to date.
- Consider making the requirements for associates 75 transactions, but don't specify what type of transaction (the current requirement is 200 transactions with 75 new records).

Funnels

Judy Knop discussed her attempt to set up a CONSER funnel. Having ATLA authenticate records that other libraries created didn't work because individual members weren't receiving CONSER credits or recognition. Judy suggested a better structure where coordinators at each funnel institution have a CONSER authorization to allow them to authenticate records. The records can be reviewed by ATLA and the funnel institutions receive appropriate CONSER credits for their work.

Joint BIBCO/CONSER meeting May 2, 2003

Updates from the utilities

OCLC:

This summer OCLC expects to move to the Oracle platform and introduce the Windows based client interface for OCLC Connexion. A lot of work has been done on indexing requirements for cataloging and reference. Some adjustments in normalization practice may be necessary for the new system.

OCLC removed 60,000 510 fields this spring. Another MARC 21 update will be implemented by OCLC in mid-May, though there are not major changes for CONSER and BIBCO libraries. Implementation of bibliographic level "i" will be delayed for up to

two years or more. OCLC would prefer to get its new system entirely in place before implementing “i” so that it does not need to implement and maintain it in multiple systems.

A feature that will be implemented soon in OCLC is the ability to click on linking fields to retrieve the related record. This feature is based on using the OCLC record control number, so libraries should be encouraged to include the OCLC number in links.

Action: CONSER will update its documentation to require input of the OCLC record control number along with other elements of the linking field.

RLIN:

Ed Glazier reported that RLIN has implemented bibliographic level code “i” so that libraries can take advantage of it for integrating resources. Major changes in infrastructure are taking place: database migration is ongoing, the cataloger client is undergoing development and a move to a relational database with data stored in xml is underway. RLIN’s telnet client will be retired sometime this year or next. Work on a browser based interface is ongoing and a Windows based technical services client will replace RLIN’s terminal for Windows software. Unicode will be fully supported so that records can be created in the vernacular.

Linking Task Force

Michael Charbonneau (U. Indiana) reported on this group’s examination of how ILS’s make use of linking fields. The group has found that all the major vendors make use of information in the fields, but they vary in how they display the information locally.

PURL survey

Renette Davis (U. Chicago) described the OCLC/PCC PURL service and the survey of CONSER and BIBCO members that was recently conducted. The project is open to CONSER and BIBCO members who wish to create PURLs for free Web resources and over 3,000 have been created at this point. The survey explored barriers to participation in the project. Most respondents felt creating PURLs did not take a lot of time and it was an easy process. Relying solely on local link checking software doesn’t benefit all network users the way using PURLs would.

Renette pointed out that all BIBCO and CONSER catalogers with OCLC authorizations can register to use the server and can make changes to existing URLs if they find a PURL that does not work. The PURL project also has a listserv, that is very useful for getting advice about using the PURL server. Information about the project is available from the CONSER PURL Website at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/purl/main.html>

Non-English Language Records

Jean Hirons asked BIBCO and CONSER members to consider pursuing a change in PCC and OCLC policies that call for changing non-English language records, found on OCLC to English as part of the authentication process. There was discussion of this issue with Mexican libraries at the recent FORO meeting and it has been discussed at other forums, particularly regarding Spanish language records. The policy may be a barrier to expansion of PCC participation in non-English speaking countries, while being able to retain such records would probably make libraries creating them feel their efforts aren't lost or discarded. CONSER and OCLC have the precedent of accepting French and English language records for the same title, identified by a language code in the 040 \$b. Could a similar practice be accepted by CONSER and BIBCO for Spanish and other non-English language records?

Action: There was agreement that the issue should be put placed on the PCC Steering Committee Agenda. Until PCC policy is changed however, the status quo for changing such records will be followed. [Glenn Patton responded that OCLC is currently investigating a new approach to accept non-English language records.]

Report from BIBCO: Integrating Resources documentation. Discussion of IR policies

Ana Cristán (LC) reported that the SCCTP Cataloging Integrating Resources Workshop has been completed and is on its way to CDS. A new module of the BIBCO and CCM manuals covering integrating resources has been drafted by Alice Jacobs (NLM) and Diane Boehr (NLM) and is under review and was discussed by BIBCO at its Operations meeting. A summary of BIBCO's decisions for the new integrating resources module can be found in the BIBCO Operations Meeting report. Some of the decisions will lead to changes in LCRI. Highlights include:

- A change in the default for determining whether a resource is a monograph or an integrating resource. The default will now be to consider it an integrating resource. LCRI 1.0 will be changed to reflect this. LCRI 1.0 also will be changed to indicate that the entire LCRI is PCC practice, except for the list of resources LC will always treat as monographs.
- Frequency and regularity codes. The decision was made to record the appropriate frequency and optionally record regularity for integrating resources.
- Order of notes. LCRI 1.7B has been drafted to specify a best practice for order of notes in PCC records. It says that AACR2 order of notes should be preferred, "... unless there are mitigating circumstances that result in a different order (e.g., a policy decision applicable to a particular cooperative enterprise, the requirements

of a particular system, an administrative decision not to re-order notes when doing copy cataloging).”

Judy Kuhagen (LC) noted that the Sept. 2003 update of AACR2 will include the addition of "rearrangement" of a word indicating a type of resource to minor change category i of 21.2a.

Steve Shadle described a new PCC discussion list devoted to cataloging of integrating resources. An announcement will be made through the PCC listserv, when it is operational.

Report from CONSER: the aggregator-neutral record

Jean Hiron gave a summary of CONSER's discussion of the aggregator-neutral record. CONSER agreed that the record elements for records OCLC cleans up and those produced by CONSER catalogers will include at least one URL. Records for titles in article-based databases created through a machine-derived process would not include URLs. One remaining question was whether principles for creating a single aggregator-neutral record should be applied to databases where a database is distributed by several different aggregators. A comment was made that it might be useful to look at several types of databases and determine what kind of access is needed. It was decided that the issue of aggregator-neutral records for databases should be revisited after some specific examples were collected and record requirements determined.

The future: FRBR and FRANAR

Everett Allgood (New York University) led the discussion.

Relator terms and codes

LCRI 21.0D instructs catalogers, in most cases, not to include relator terms and use of relator codes is limited to certain types of material, e.g. music. Should PCC make wider use of MARC 21 relator codes for personal and corporate bodies in light of the Joint Steering Committee's plans to incorporate FRBR into the cataloging code?

Discussion: Giving the relator term in the case of illustrators, as provided in the LCRI, helps to make a distinction in the context of the larger database, but when is it useful for corporate bodies? It was LC that decided not to use the relator terms or codes precisely because it is sometimes difficult to decide what role a corporate body plays. Examples are whether a body is the rights holder or issuing body.

It was pointed out that relator codes work better for some types of material than others, for example, codes used with rare book and music cataloging are useful. Another comment suggested that the usability of relator codes would be enhanced if OPAC

displays could interpret the codes and if there were more meaningful codes for corporate bodies.

Next step: PCC should discuss this with CC:DA, since CC:DA is exploring the issue. If PCC wants to take a lead on this, it will be presented to the PCC Policy Committee for approval.

What is an expression?

BIBCO/CONSER members were asked how useful the FRBR concepts, form of expression (means by which the work is realized, e.g. alpha-numeric notation, musical notation, spoken word, etc.) and form of work (e.g. a genre such as novel, play, poem, essay, etc.) might be in defining qualifiers for uniform titles in continuing resource records.

The major/minor title change rules for words that denote a type of resource raised questions about serials and form of work terms. In cases where terms that denote a type of resource are added or dropped, there is no major change, in cases where the term is changed from one to another there is. In the case of a major change, does the new title represent a new work or, if the numbering is continuous, is the new title an expression of the same work? How do these FRBR terms relate to serial title changes?

Publishers often have their own ideas about the changes they make and whether they consider them to denote a new work. Under the ISTC proposal, publishers would have control over identifying new works, though they might not always agree with us on what constitutes a new work!

It was agreed that a conceptualization of a FRBR display for a continuing resource would be helpful to identify the data separately at different levels. Perhaps the JSC subcommittee chaired by Jennifer Bowen could look at models for serials and integrating resources.

Where does the aggregator-neutral record fit into FRBR?

It is hard to see how the aggregator-neutral record fits in with FRBR at this time because aggregator-neutral records cover multiple manifestations, but not all physical manifestations. So they are neither at the expression nor manifestation level.

Decision: The Task Force on FRBR and Continuing Resources should determine desired outcomes from applying FRBR, develop some models, and test them to provide feedback on how FRBR should work for continuing resources.

Next meeting: May 6-7, 2004